REMARKS

It is noted that Page 1 of the Office Action, under "Office Action Summary", does not show box 12 or box 12(a) checked as received, whereas the Certified Copy of the Priority U.K. Application was previously filed by Applicant's Counsel, and received by the P.T.O. per Counsel's returned postcard.

If it has not reached the Examiner, the Examiner is requested to telephone Counsel.

With respect to the drawings, a "New Sheet" 8/8 is submitted herewith which has numerals 54 and 57 omitted per the Examiner's instructions.

With respect to the merits, the allowable substance of former Claims 16 - 20 has been noted with appreciation. New Claim 21 incorporates the allowable subject matter of former Claim 16 into former parent Claim 14 and intermediate Claim 15.

Accordingly, New parent Claim 21 is believed to be clearly allowable.

New Claims 22 - 34 are dependant on allowable parent Claim

21, and each positively recites the totally novel **combinations** of more specific elements, which combinations are taught only by Applicant in solving the longstanding, and very serious problem, of damaging tubulars.

Accordingly, each of dependent Claims 22 - 34 is sincerely believed to be clearly allowable.

With respect to New Claims 35 and 36, new parent Claim 35 is modeled on former Claim 14, but now positively recites:

> "moving means for moving said slips in a substantially purely radial motion."

It is this totally novel feature which solves the **longstanding** problem of seriously damaging tubulars, as disclosed and explained **only** in Applicant's Specification.

No such means are taught or suggested in the prior art, and none have achieved this non-obvious breakthrough in the art.

For example, the Poe et al Patent 4,715,456 is typical of the prior art slips. As shown in attached Exhibit A, his slips 61

move vertically a **greater** distance than they do radially; i.e., horizontally. By comparison, Exhibit B shows that Applicant's slips move **substantially less** in the vertical direction than in the radial-horizontal direction.

Thus, the Poe slips move in an **arcuate** path, as shown in Exhibit A, and it is this arcuate engagement which scores and damages the tubulars. When one considers the **hundreds of thousands** of tubulars used each day in the hydrocarbon drilling art, the savings in not destroying and requiring replacement of tubulars in use results in a truly enormously unexpected result.

Given the longstanding problem, not solved by any of the experts in this art, Applicant's invention is clearly not obvious, and therefore obviously patentable.

Lastly, new independent Claim 37 is directed to the embodiment shown in FIGS. 15 - 18 wherein a first set of slips engage the cylindrical portion of the tool joint, and a second set of failsafe slips engage the shoulder of the tool joint. This preferred embodiment not only secures the tubular by the radial force of the first set of slips, but also positively **locks** the tubular against vertical motion; i.e., such as, for example,

dropping the entire drill string down the bore hole. Dependent Claim 38 further adds the novel feature of operating both sets of slips by a single motor.

This is also a new and unexpected result, which is no where taught in the prior art.

Accordingly, each of new Claims 21 - 38 is firmly believed to be allowable, and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald B. Sherer

Ronald B. Sherer
Counsel for Applicant
Registration No. 19,977

Bartlett & Sherer
103 South Shaffer Drive
New Freedom, PA 17349
Telephone: (717)227-1197
Fax: (717)227-9008